

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace Figs. 1 and 2 with the enclosed drawing figures.

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Replacement drawing figures 1 and 2 are enclosed herewith. The message or greeting (element 22) as described in the specification is now depicted. The specification has been amended to identify the “gap” by the numeral 24. Accordingly the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 17-19, 24-30 and 33 have been amended. The amendments are fully supported in the as-filed specification. Claims 20-23, 31-32 and 34 have been cancelled. The presently pending claims are 17-19, 24-30 and 33.

Since claim 23 has been cancelled, its rejection under §112, second paragraph, is rendered moot.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 21, 23-25, 28, 29 and 33 stand rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Dawson, US 5,771,614. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Dawson, the lips of the mouth lie in a plane that is orthogonal to the hinge of the card. By contrast, in the claimed invention, the lips of the mouth lie in a plane that is parallel to the hinge of the card (and orthogonal to the plane swept out by the face of the leaves of the card when the card is closed). This relationship is now reflected in amended claim 17.

In Dawson, and (using the wording in amended claim 17), the mouth, “defined by the gap separating opposing wall portions of the pair of jaws”, lies in a plane that contacts the web (or the vertical hinge of the “assembly support 28”).

By contrast, in the claimed invention (using the wording in amended claim 17), the mouth is “defined by the gap separating opposing wall portions of the pair of jaws remote

from the web". (Essentially, the web 16 is the hinge of the card in the claimed invention.)

Amendments similar to the foregoing have been made to claim 28. Accordingly, since the claims now distinguish over the teachings of Dawson, the rejection for anticipation under §102(a) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.


The Examiner has rejected claims 19, 22, 26, 30 and 34 over Dawson in view of Barreca et al. US 5,551,730. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the teachings of Dawson, the primary reference, and Barreca, the secondary reference, do not suggest or teach the arrangement of structural elements recited in dependent claims 19, 26 and 30. Since the claims distinguish over the references, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is solicited.

The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees which may be due and which have not been submitted herewith to our Deposit Account No. 01-0035.

Respectfully submitted,

  
JAY S. CINAMON  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 24,156

ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB  
666 THIRD AVENUE, 10TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017  
Tel.: (212) 949-9022  
Fax: (212) 949-9190